

REMARKS

By the foregoing Amendment, Claim 27 has been amended, and Claims 1, 3-14 and 16-25 have been cancelled. Claims 27-35 remain pending. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, on the grounds of indefiniteness; these claims are now cancelled.

Claims 1 and 3-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from Briles in view of Bogatz, and further in view of Rath; these claims are now cancelled.

Claims 13, 14, 16, 17, 20-23, 27, 28 and 31-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from Briles in view of Bogatz and further in view of Dixon. Claims 13, 14, 16, 17 and 20-23 have been cancelled. Claim 27 has been amended to recite "a swage tool having an anvil" and "said swage tool including an outer nut rotatably engaged with said anvil, and an outer sleeve threadably engaged with said nut, said anvil being disposed within said outer sleeve." Referring to Figs. 4B, 4C, and 7A-7D, and the specification at page 8, lines 1-2, the swaging tool of the invention is driven over the collar by a pneumatic impact tool (as opposed to the squeeze type swage tool of Dixon). The features of the outer nut being rotatably engaged with the anvil, the outer sleeve being threadably engaged with the nut, and the anvil being disposed within the outer sleeve are important for extracting the narrow point at 32 of the anvil of the tool from the collar after the collar has been swaged, where the swage tool can otherwise

become stuck, and difficult to extract from the collar after the swaging operation.

Viewing Fig. 7D, once the swage tool has become stuck on a collar placed over a pin installed through a workpiece, it is possible to turn the nut 66 to force the outer sleeve 72 against the workpiece and force the anvil 20,62 off of the collar 3, bringing the narrowed point 32 of the swaging tool off of the collar as the anvil 20,62 is extracted by rotation of the nut 66. Of the references cited by the Examiner, only Dixon relates to the feature of a swage tool recited in Claim 27. Dixon discloses the business end of a swage tool 54e in Fig. 10, (part of the tool 48e including reaction member 70 and the swage anvil 56e), but none of the references teach, disclose or suggest a swage fastening system for an assembly of workpieces including a swage tool including an outer nut rotatably engaged with an anvil of the swage tool, an outer sleeve threadably engaged with the nut, and the anvil being disposed within the outer sleeve, such as would allow the swage tool to be extracted from a collar swaged over a pin. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the claims as amended patentably distinguish the combination of Briles, Bogatz and Dixon, and that the rejection of Claims 13, 14, 16, 17, 20-23, 27, 28 and 31-35 on the grounds of obviousness from Briles in view of Bogatz and further in view of Dixon should be withdrawn.

Claims 18, 19, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from modified Briles as applied to claims 13, 17, 27 and 28 (Briles in view of Bogatz and further in view of Dixon) and further in view of Rath, which was cited as disclosing a collar made of aluminum or titanium. Claims 18 and 19 have been cancelled. Claims 29 and 30 depend from Claim 27, and in view of the foregoing

amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims as amended patentably distinguish the combination of Briles, Bogatz, Dixon and Rath, and that the rejection of Claims 5, 6, 18, 19, 29 and 30 on the grounds of obviousness from Briles in view of Bogatz in view of Dixon and further in view of Rath should be withdrawn.

Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from modified Briles as applied to claims 1 and 13 (Briles in view of Bogatz, and further in view of Rath, and Briles in view of Bogatz and further in view of Dixon), and further in view of Breed. Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 have been cancelled.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application should now be in condition for allowance, and an early favorable action in this regard is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies or fees in connection with this amendment to Deposit Account No. 06-2425.

Respectfully submitted,
FULWIDER PATTON LLP

By: /James W. Paul/
James W. Paul
Reg. No. 29,967

JWP/eab
Howard Hughes Center
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Telephone: (310) 824-5555
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696
Customer No. 24201